

2-15-12

"This is trading chocolates."

(cigarettes)

weapons

Threatening weapons

Myth (of arms reduction)

PO thinks "can't be effective"

(arms, Soviet)

have never been effective

aren't legit, moral controversial
(arms for bishops or 104)

D-L "

couldn't work"

(arms for US

(China) in '50's,
early '60's

Three series:

Myth:

a D-L/CF/FS force (not "cop"?)
was ^{necessary} useful (only) to make credible
EU threats against ^{the} SU (Berling (then NATO)
of the SU/Rus
to prevent to deter SU from repeating
(during CW) to US EU with
too use weapons ("2nd use")
or (if against SU troops) escalate.
at worst

(also used a "robust" 2nd strike
force, to keep them from prompting,
(i.e. US wants to limit the
2nd strike cop. as much as possible:
certainly make it worst less than the
FS cop, to give us an incentive
to prompt

(even if we can't eliminate the
incentive to prompt).


We'll the costs will be small enough
to be unstable w/out SU too much
(2nd use) or etc

- even at the price of the force
being unstable

(Both for us within the limits
being an incentive to prompt).

Best is: We do, they don't. (C-TH:

SU wouldn't have a difference between
the FS and the 2nd strike (though
we would: they don't use 2nd-strike cop)
and we would have a big difference between our FS + sec.



	1	2
1	-20, -100 X	-10, -100
2	-30, -100	X

There is no country now which
has 500-1000 targets that want to be
targeted or destroyed in a ^{US} FS
war of annihilation — but is there.

(We don't plan to attack R, USSR
or any ally (it has none)
R doesn't threaten any US ally.

(unless NATO takes in
Ukraine and/or Rumania...)

— only rationale for
Is it enough — politically — to
prop MCMs, for 1000 warheads?

2-15-12

"Rufles think its the end of the world
if we gave up our power to blow up
the world —

to destroy civilization
to end life on earth
to annihilate Russia & Europe + ^{Asia} China

I'd be happy to debate anyone who
would defend the proposition

that our national security requires
is an endorsement of our ^{current} strategy
to [conquer] another world
end life on earth

or exterminate every all the inhabitants
of Russia, Europe, China, Asia
and civilization on the entire Hemisphere
on earth

or admit R reduction to their levels
We cannot stop profit with it unless
(as an absolute emergency)

we forfeit (conf. unilaterally, ^{unilaterally w. Russia} that
as a unilateral measure)

2) FU thinks

4) the above capabilities, represented by
Hovers began the 2-11 board

(began the next lesson after R)

(or unilateral thunder)
— No leader should have these powers; as seen in WW2

(peace, esp.)
A move that longer than needed
is certainly illegitimate, criminal, immoral.

(To say as mentioned needs, as has a legit
move purpose that can be needed of
a move that

is not behind by any NWS, or
several others

(then

Long?!

Will we show Egypt, Saudi Arabia,
~~Algeria~~ Argentina, Kenya, Jordan,
South Korea — if they want to get moves?
(What but Iran, or Syria? :)

(South Korea — too late)

It will be much longer for a terrorist
to get moves in a weekend with 12-15
NWS than with the count 9.

(Pak, is further?)
NK?

US going down to 3-400 and calling for
mutual cuts beyond is the best prospect
of stopping Iran — the /or NFO

(then press on India, Pak, Brazil, R for NFO
+ others)

2-1-12

Madman theory —

That adversary could be convinced
and even dangerously mad
was no theory — or, it was a
very sound, compelling theory.

Just ~~show~~ give our plans — or
better, give a spy our plans

(Polish General Staff)

They were (and are) ~~mad~~ — the
people: Polish jokes. Words of wisdom (this is
those days, all men. Now, probably
not. (or different?)

~~Philosophy~~ Not entirely — not chaotic nonsense
is all the ~~that~~ daily life — promises
are half like things that. Even at the
most detached from reality, a kind of
logic & reason (an intuition); if you
can find it — which isn't always hard.
Except its ~~not~~. (Crazy logic;
Nutsy logic)

A segmented psychosis — (MBC, of college
A common irrational phenomenon ^{others...}
and as you have to be...

epigram

Nietzsche: madness

So — a state mad enough to make these ^{obscure} plans
was mad enough to use them.

Why they Reagan (google)

my Ant of Communism was based on
savage apions! (1959)

Why? Because communists.

Merlo retreating - for prospect they
Cultural risk - in prospect they?

If I quote my 1961 ~~chapter~~ volume of PP -
that's TS! (? downgraded?)
FOIA?

|| or of my memo on my 1962 SLOP
Could they have helped a foreign power,
or harmed the US? see PP!

(Rise Vonnegut!) open revealed -
(Anti funding in US - not really;
spend on race? Gann's knew,
they not really -
still!

2-9-12

D.M. Book

12:02 AM

Thursday AM

Kenny - tries to get target plans
cannot

- But I know

- See N/HAR to Shrike on me

(B. efficient)

- see my SIOB across

+ RAND TS safe

ASSM-3

- 1961 - 600M

2-9-12

600 M

Deterrence theory / Doctrine

Can a deterrent threat
be too big?

unjust?

immoral?

criminal?

(Premise: deterring an illegitimate act
(vs. a complicit threat with
an unjust demand or tactic

Note: look for a theory/doctrine of

the ethics of risks (gamblers)
or threats

(or promises!

e.g. secrecy agreements!

or loyalty / obedience
commitments

(perhaps concealment or camouflage)

Σ.

first War (Christians - vs. Christians)

(ant, Austria)

but also, bourgeois
officials

first Genocide

first Terrorism
Terror

(Progressives accept
this in TR, revolution!)

vs. them

S.B.

[EDT's "extortionism" = no one wanted to
be both committed to (in "normal" times)]

1) threat of extortion

2) project, machines, cap. to
carry it out in some
circumstances.

cf. criminal threats

or promises

(criminal?)

important

infrastructure

illegal? (extortion...)

DM

12:30 AM

2-1-12

Under the circumstances that would cause
a county to think of striking first (preemptively)

(see > WWB: 2001 for SU)

amount of great damage from intel
would not be enough to deter —

if FS is much better than 2nd strike

when does a county have to be about sure
of great intel to be deterred from FS?

Envision:

Must change our
mode of thinking.

1. There ^{+ threat} is an
instrument of policy.
or "option"

2. Threat of one
war, and physical/
inst. / political

Prep. for it, Members
for it, is (not only an option
but) a necessity for
(1) S. S. C. ... us)

3. Introduction of wer
is an option

[What is "wer"?

Kilger? frog now?

US: Pak, Iran, Somalia,
Sweden?)

1-29-12

How deten
"beach" into
Went Homey"?
(read on
Warsaw Post)

Army C ?!

C-II
+ deten

(Paul Harvey)

Without knowing the
reasons the "posture"
came to be what it
was [NOT "deten"
and FS"] you (public

Congress, anti-rac)
couldn't imagine
what it was —
of believed realistic
concepts of what
it was

(of understand when
it was happening, of
obstacles to change,
or why it was as
large as it was).

BUT just to know
a little the "incomprehensible"
is not enough — it

must be overwhelmed
by the prompt
that these reasons
were wildly
"inadequate" as
justification - that
there could be
no justification
(unless - or even if -
the wildly delusional
reasons or hypnotic
- and then, when these
were dispensed
(the WWI...)



L-81-12

see above, no Gift
in Persian Gulf

Center - abal.

min det
200 min

(Feb 77?)

→ Center Doctrine

RU

co. SU!

CENTCOM

ROF

Type II:

Ngos.

(MX, CM!)

(Crisis of mid-80!)

Jack Anderson

(abal. l. 80!)

(We humans would
prefer a post-attack
situation where we
come out worse
than the enemy (^{if we had} ~~murders~~,
no response) but
~~the~~ "thy" / advising
comes out worse
than attacking, prob-
ably more than "us"

Even if there is
more collateral damage
- animals, plants, life
on earth.

[See EAC. Home

(and suppose
costs/damage are
reflected on 3rd
parties —
are within
prob. rises.

a danger: loss of
our control

(+ loss of leaders —
are good in deep. / R.B.)

It is very hard to
offset ~~the~~ 2nd-stroke
cap.

without also offsetting
~~the~~ 1st-stroke
cap

(after negating
improvement in 2nd stroke
cap, wrot crisis
stability.)

Compare: adding
horizontal minutes or
also (to soft cap.)

2-7-12

us. putting spitting
nouns is also,
or eliminating soft
cap. as demand is
adjusted

[ever done?

= substantively nouns
for CBMs, us.
relating nouns.

[one of Circle Analysis

What lies behind

payoffs? De-construct
them ...

2-7-12

~~the~~ Any one
explosion above-
ground
affects the whole
globe.

(esp. nearby
countries).

No above-ground
explosion (surface,
air-burst, space)
affects only the target
country.

Other countries
~~to~~ (without
being ones, without
being mil. targets,
without posing
threat to anyone)
— to some extent,
all countries —
are affected
(adversely, damaged/
harmed/endangered)
by any war attack,
large or small, or by

a multi-domain
(Chemical,
Fukushima)

thus, have a stake
in (are engaged
by) the new posture,
plans, threats,
C³ and decision-making
processes (and leadership)
of every NWS.

(see global concern about
atmospheric testing.)

Should be considerable
concern about
plans/etc. for
war.

(he who would be
affected by US/Is
attack on Roseng,
Iran underground
facilities

(which increase
chance of the attack
on Iran (more than a
mobile or several weapons).

DM

2-7-12

The rational
incentive to
attack [G.S.]
with ones
is not inhibited
(or affected) by
considering its
consequences for the
attacker

— independently
(without consideration of)
the consequences of his

struck before
cutting

(before landing
any missiles

[cf. in WWI -
before mobilizing
fully. How true
was this in WWII?

See air attack
See Prussian G
General in Long-Boy War;

—
—
—

Wanted our power
held onto West
Berlin without
any unilateral?

(We sent Guba &
couldn't get it
back - SO unhappy!
+ thrust to Berlin
despite superiority
|| (in JFK comm
vs. Khrushchev!)

if not Want Berlin,
what?

NATO ...

US in Europe?

CW?

what if we didn't

hold SVN in 50's?

60's? 69-75?

("lose all SEA,
India, etc. ? decisions

2-11

DM

Typically

When we ~~was~~ act
to make it less
likely that an opponent
will strike us in
some circumstances

(an enemy I-S out of

the blue: non-crisis

[e.g. Pearl Harbor

was a crisis; Japanese
attack was preemptive

of US response to
a Japanese move
elsewhere they were
about to make!)

(like Israeli
~~attack~~ on Iran -
to prompt Iran
response to a further
Israeli assault or
espionage or sabotage?
and to prompt
Iran for deterring

to ^{his} attend on
him in response
to him subject
to Navas, Hayballuk

Abolition

Counter

(Rogers)

UFK

[Aki]

(Auto controls)

2-7-12

(Nothing is "Too cheap"
to be contemplated,
or done. Final
solution

(see SU MARM,
in Cuba;
SU diligence of ^{these are}
(ordered until
Oct. 22:

- intent big take
to US (of these uses, in
diligence) SH

Dr. Kromer: David Hurd

2-7-12

For stability,

2 NWS may be
better/more stable
(better from one even
and from longer non-
one attack/corner)
than 1 -

depending on
position: not only on
NWS/NNWS status,
~~but~~ and not only on number

Salvatore
Speech
1-29-12

Left out of the
speech

"No gap" (McN)

NO ... 160?

40?

1000?

- 4!

= thousands

= hundred gap

= Saddam

= How? (see HIF-07

2011

missed

[No gap corresponding to

... not a wide RAND R's!

but all in wrong
direction, too big,
forcing bigger US
power -

except SU IRBMs
(in Asia! in Europe!
Delegation: ^{error} person's
EU, ES! mission!)

(except Person ⁺¹⁰⁰ (Tokyo;
see his mention to and
NIE") + to C-II - encourage
movement) (diplomacy)
power in SEC, not PS..

the - MIC - gap
(x that been
by done

the / the
that been

LBS / REK - Halftime
Committee

Public must take
commitment

(x Congress - investigate

is well so. (Prevent

Prevent
murder of death

Investigate
(Not. Sec.)

Amo Trade

= Tobacco

Class action suits!

MIC + Wall St. as

pushers, dealers,

"source"

addiction

1-30-02

Wf is the "after"
100. Area more
available than
no. NK, Pak...

Why are America,
Pak, ^(100%) several justified
is over 100-200
wounded - 57
the 5?

(York; MCB B
(center).
TS(1) when are 200?)

[What should be
said of the
(equality, character)
of the decision-making
and decision-making
before & during WWII?

[or S.B. in WWII?]

Romano 1-29

G. being that
man is on a
crash program
of war

= "SU border
A mental gap

= SU FS people
(Kavil)

= Man are people

= (Rumbold's mental)
(~~though~~ 1991)

= Soderman's

ADW point

of contracts, but
on vulnerability
(occurrence of stans)
missiles, sinking,
mining, curance)
and C², etc.

(e.g. protection

vs. UA ...)

But 3 can be more
stable than 2

[China - threatened
by US (which also threatens SC
and to SC)

2-2-12

Strangelove:

- After ending his WADDS
Program in '95, SA
failed to come clean
and coop. with OX
(to and sometimes)

(to and threat as-
sessment)

(see K bluff re
ICBMs in 1958-62!)

Sometimes continued:
200,000 troops died!

or 4 > 3

(Austria vs. China

and US: (1971)

(Bangladesh)

(but then

4 → 5 (Pol)

(NK is safer than
with non-war attacks

(Clinton 1994)

and war attacks

(US: actively standing
second, ~~and~~ more favorable

(only one county
has had a FS/FU
program

(though SU would
turn to: bluffs ^{long} C-I
(not bluffs in C-I!))

(no other: unless
down: (Pak?))

→
DENOUNCE "options"
of FU/FS:
(Rev Paul)

from like C-II

BNO doesn't want
war (nor does
Iran) [Israel, his
area, a
wild card)

but loc. communities
create chaos for
Israel, misjudgment...
misadventure

Blow: (mis)maneuvers
in Gulf; neither can
afford to back down,
without losing prestige and
possibly the job.